

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

William R. Hamilton,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Civil Action No.: 1:12-cv-22-TLW-SVH
)	
Patelco Credit Union,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	

ORDER

On January 3, 2012, the plaintiff, William R. Hamilton (“plaintiff”), proceeding pro se, filed this civil action. (Doc. # 1). The plaintiff filed a motion to transfer venue to the United States District Court for the Northern District of California. (Doc. # 29). The defendant filed a response in which it consented to the transfer. (Doc. # 30). The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Shiva V. Hodges pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2), DSC.

This matter now comes before this Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by the Magistrate Judge to whom this case had previously been assigned. (Doc. # 33). On March 20, 2012, the Magistrate Judge issued the Report. In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the District Court grant the plaintiff’s motion to transfer venue (Doc. # 29) and leave the defendant’s motion to dismiss (Doc. # 24) pending for ruling by the transferee court. (Doc. # 33). The parties filed no objections to the Report. Objections were due on April 6, 2012.

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge’s Report and Recommendation to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept,

reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

The Court has carefully reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation. It is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report is **ACCEPTED**. (Doc. # 33). For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, the plaintiff's motion to transfer venue to the United States District Court for the Northern District of California (Doc. # 29) is **GRANTED**. The defendant's motion to dismiss (Doc. # 24) is to be left pending for ruling by the transferee court.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Terry L. Wooten
United States District Judge

May 11, 2012
Florence, South Carolina